

1 Michael Kind, Esq.
2 Nevada Bar No.: 13903
KIND LAW
3 8860 South Maryland Parkway, Suite 106
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89123
5 (702) 337-2322
6 (702) 329-5881 (fax)
7 mk@kindlaw.com

8 George Haines Esq.
9 Nevada Bar No. 9411
10 Gerardo Avalos Esq.
11 Nevada Bar No. 15171
FREEDOM LAW FIRM
12 8985 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 350
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89123
14 (702) 880-5554
15 (702) 385-5518 (fax)
16 Ghaines@freedomlegalteam.com
Counsel for Plaintiff Sylvia Castuera

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
18 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

19 Sylvia Castuera,

20 Case No.:

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.
23 Complaint for damages under the
24 National Consumer Telecom &
25 Utilities Exchange, Inc; AT&T
26 Mobility LLC,
27 Defendants.

Introduction

1. The United States Congress has found the banking system is dependent up-on fair and accurate credit reporting. Inaccurate credit reports directly impair the efficiency of the banking system, and unfair credit reporting methods undermine the public confidence, which is essential to the continued functioning of the banking system. Congress enacted the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq. (“FCRA”), to ensure fair and accurate re-reporting, promote efficiency in the banking system, and protect consumer privacy. The FCRA seeks to ensure consumer reporting agencies exercise their grave responsibilities with fairness, impartiality, and a respect for the consumer’s right to privacy because consumer reporting agencies have assumed such a vital role in assembling and evaluating consumer credit and other information on consumers. The FCRA also imposes duties on the sources that provide credit information to credit reporting agencies, called “furnishers.”
 2. The FCRA protects consumers through a tightly wound set of procedural protections from the material risk of harms that otherwise flow from inaccurate reporting. Thus, through the FCRA, Congress struck a balance between the credit industry’s desire to base credit decisions on accurate information, and consumers’ substantive right to protection from damage to reputation, shame, mortification, and the emotional distress that naturally follows from inaccurate reporting of a consumer’s fidelity to his or her financial obligations.
 3. Sylvia Castuera (“Plaintiff”), by counsel, brings this action to challenge the actions of National Consumer Telecom & Utilities Exchange, Inc ('NCTUE"); and AT&T Mobility LLC ("AT&T"), with regard to erroneous reports of derogatory credit information to national reporting agencies and Defendants' failure to properly investigate Plaintiff's disputes.

- 1 **4.** Plaintiff makes these allegations on information and belief, with the exception of
- 2 those allegations that pertain to Plaintiff, which Plaintiff alleges on personal
- 3 knowledge.
- 4 **5.** While many violations are described below with specificity, this Complaint
- 5 alleges violations of the statutes cited in their entirety.
- 6 **6.** Unless otherwise stated, all the conduct engaged in by Defendants took place in
- 7 Nevada.
- 8 **7.** Any violations by Defendants were knowing, willful, and intentional, and
- 9 Defendants did not maintain procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such
- 10 violations.
- 11 **8.** Defendants failed to properly investigate Plaintiff's disputes, damaging Plaintiff's
- 12 creditworthiness.

Jurisdiction and Venue

14 9. Jurisdiction of this Court arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question
15 jurisdiction); 15 U.S.C. § 1681.

16 10. This action arises out of Defendants' violations of the FCRA.

17 11. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada
18 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because Plaintiff is a resident of Clark County,
19 Nevada and because Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in Clark
20 County, Nevada as they conduct business here. Venue is also proper because the
21 conduct giving rise to this action occurred in Nevada. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

Parties

23 12. Plaintiff is a natural person living in Clark County, Nevada. In addition,
24 Plaintiff is a “consumer” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1681a(c).
25 13. Defendants are each a corporation doing business in the State of Nevada.

14. AT&T Mobility is a furnisher of information as contemplated by 15 U.S.C. § 1681s-2(b) that regularly and in the ordinary course of business furnishes information to a consumer credit reporting agency. NCTUE regularly assembles and/or evaluates consumer credit information for the purpose of furnishing consumer reports to third parties and uses interstate commerce to prepare and/or furnish the reports. This entity is a “consumer reporting agency” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1681a(f).
 15. Unless otherwise indicated, the use of Defendants’ names in this Complaint includes all agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers of the named Defendants.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

Re: Bankruptcy Case No. (20-14693)

16. On or about Sep 22, 2020, Plaintiff filed for bankruptcy in the United States bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §1301 et seq. (the “bankruptcy”).
 17. The obligations to each creditor-furnisher herein (as applicable) were scheduled in the bankruptcy and each respective creditor, or its predecessor in interest, received notice of the bankruptcy.
 18. None of the creditor-furnishers named herein filed any proceedings to declare their alleged debts “non-dischargeable” pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 523 et seq.
 19. No creditor-furnisher named herein obtained relief from the “automatic stay” codified at 11 U.S.C. §362 et seq. while Plaintiff’s bankruptcy was pending to pursue Plaintiff for any personal liability.
 20. Further, while the automatic stay was in effect during the bankruptcy, it was illegal and inaccurate for any creditor-furnisher named herein to report any post-bankruptcy derogatory collection information, pursuant to the Orders

entered by the bankruptcy Court.

1 reported the inaccurate information, thus violating their duty to follow
 2 reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy under 15 U.S.C. §
 3 1681e(b) when preparing a consumer report.

4 **30.** To this end, the adverse reporting on Plaintiff's consumer report departed from
 5 the credit industry's own reporting standards and was not only inaccurate, but
 6 also materially misleading under the CDIA's standards as well.

7 **31.** A "materially misleading" statement is concerned with omissions to credit
 8 entries, that in context create misperceptions about otherwise may be factually
 9 accurate data. *Gorman v. Wolpoff & Abramson, LLP*, 584 F.3d 1147, 1163 (9th
 10 Cir. 2009).

11 **NCTUE and AT&T Misreported Consumer Information**

12 **and Failed to Investigate Plaintiff's Dispute**

13 **Re: AT&T Mobility Account No. ****0337**

14 **32.** In Plaintiff's consumer report from NCTUE dated Feb 2, 2021, NCTUE and
 15 AT&T inaccurately reported that Plaintiff has a Charge-Off Amount Of: \$4.93.
 16 This was inaccurate, misleading, and derogatory because Plaintiff filed for
 17 bankruptcy on Sep 22, 2020 and Plaintiff received a discharge on Dec 22, 2020.

18 **33.** On Mar 5, 2021, Plaintiff disputed the inaccurate reporting pursuant to 15
 19 U.S.C. § 1681i, by notifying NCTUE, in writing, of the inaccurate, misleading,
 20 and derogatory information.

21 **34.** Specifically, Plaintiff sent a letter, certified, return receipt, to NCTUE,
 22 requesting the above inaccurate information be updated, modified, or corrected.

23 **35.** NCTUE was required to conduct a reinvestigation into the disputed information
 24 on Plaintiff's consumer report pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1681i.

25 **36.** Upon information and belief, NCTUE timely notified AT&T regarding
 26 Plaintiff's dispute, as required under 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(2).

27 **37.** Upon information and belief, NCTUE provided AT&T with a notice regarding

1 Plaintiff's dispute under 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(5)(A).

2 **38.** Upon information and belief, NCTUE provided all relevant information to
3 AT&T Mobility regarding Plaintiff's dispute, as required under 15 U.S.C. §
4 1681i(a)(2).

5 **39.** On or around Apr 16, 2021, Plaintiff received notice that NCTUE and AT&T
6 investigated and reinvestigated Plaintiff's dispute, as required under 15 U.S.C. §
7 1681i(a)(6).

8 **40.** A reasonable investigation by NCTUE and AT&T would have determined that
9 they were reporting the above disputed information inaccurately.

10 **41.** NCTUE and AT&T failed to review all relevant information provided by
11 Plaintiff in Plaintiff's dispute, as required by and in violation of 15 U.S.C. §
12 1681i and 15 U.S.C. § 1681s-2(b), respectively.

13 **42.** Upon information and belief, AT&T continued to report the inaccurate
14 information.

15 **43.** In turn, NCTUE re-reported the inaccurate information, thus violating its duty
16 to follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy under 15
17 U.S.C. § 1681e(b) when preparing a consumer report.

18 **44.** NCTUE and AT&T, upon receipt of Plaintiff's dispute, failed to conduct an
19 investigation or reinvestigation with respect to the disputed information as
20 required by 15 U.S.C. § 1681i and 15 U.S.C. § 1681s-2(b), respectively.

21 **45.** Due to NCTUE's and AT&T's failure to reasonably investigate, they further
22 failed to correct and update Plaintiff's information as required by 15 U.S.C. §
23 1681i and 15 U.S.C. § 1681s-2(b), thereby causing continued reporting of
24 inaccurate information in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1681i and 15 U.S.C. § 1681s-
25 2(b), respectively.

26 **46.** NCTUE's and AT&T continued inaccurate, misleading, and derogatory
27 reporting was knowing and willful, in light of their knowledge of the actual

1 error. Plaintiff is, accordingly, eligible for statutory damages.

2 **47.** Also as a result of NCTUE's and AT&T's continued inaccurate, misleading, and
3 derogatory reporting, Plaintiff has suffered actual damages, including without
4 limitation, fear of credit denials, out-of-pocket expenses in challenging the
5 inaccurate reporting, damage to Plaintiff's creditworthiness, and emotional
6 distress.

7 **48.** By inaccurately reporting consumer information after notice and confirmation
8 of their errors, NCTUE and AT&T failed to take the appropriate measures as
9 required under 15 U.S.C. § 1681i and 15 U.S.C. § 1681s-2(b), respectively.

10 **Plaintiff's damages**

11 **49.** In addition to Plaintiff's creditworthiness being negatively impacted, Plaintiff
12 suffered emotional distress and mental anguish as a result of Defendants'
13 actions described herein. In addition, Plaintiff incurred out-of-pocket costs and
14 time in attempts to dispute Defendants' actions. Plaintiff further suffered
15 humiliation and embarrassment.

16 **VIOLATION OF THE FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT**

17 **15 U.S.C. § 1681**

18 **50.** Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint
19 as though fully stated herein.

20 **51.** The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple willful,
21 reckless, or negligent violations of the FCRA, including but not limited to each
22 and every one of the above-cited provisions of the FCRA, 15 U.S.C § 1681, et
23 seq.

52. As a result of each and every willful violation of the FCRA, Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages as the Court may allow pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(1); statutory damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(1); punitive damages as the Court may allow pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(2); and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(3) from Defendants.

53. As a result of each and every negligent noncompliance of the FCRA, Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages as the Court may allow pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681o(a)(1); and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681o(a)(2) from Defendants.

Prayer for relief

54. Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants, and Plaintiff be awarded damages from Defendants, as follows:

- An award of actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(1);
 - An award of statutory damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(1);
 - An award of punitive damages as the Court may allow pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(2);
 - An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a)(3), and 15 U.S.C. § 1681(o)(a)(1); and
 - Any other relief that this Court deems just and proper.

Jury Demand

55. Pursuant to the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

Dated: March 21, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

KIND LAW

/s/ Michael Kind

Michael Kind, Esq.

8860 South Maryland Parkway, Suite 106
Las Vegas, Nevada 89123

FREEDOM LAW FIRM

/s/ George Haines

George Haines, Esq.

Gerardo Avalos, Esq.

8985 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 350

Las Vegas, Nevada 89123

Counsel for Plaintiff Sylvia Castuera